United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/018,116	04/19/2002	Lutz Fabian	EF377397961US	1556
21003 BAKER BOTT	7590 06/26/2007 CS L L P		EXAM	INER
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA			DUONG, THANH P	
44TH FLOOR NEW YORK, I	NY 10112-4498		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			1764	
			NAME DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/018,116	FABIAN ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
	<u> </u>	Tom P. Duong	1764
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANS IN THE MAIL	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION The state of the	DN. imely filed m the mailing date of this communication.
Status	· · ·		
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 Ap</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowan closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pr	rosecution as to the merits is
Dispositi	on of Claims	n parto Quayr o, 1000 O.B. 11, 4	00 0.0. 210.
5) □ 6) ☑ 7) □ 8) □ Applicati 9) □ 10) □	Claim(s) 20-39 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 20-39 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceed Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	election requirement. pted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Second is required if the drawing(s) is objected.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). pjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign particle. All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau see the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in Applicat ty documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
2) Notice 3) Inform	(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Di 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' remarks and amendments filed on April 24, 2007 have been carefully considered. Claims 20 and 39 have been amended. Claims 20-39 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 1. Claims 20-31 and 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barton '877 in view of Carr et al. (5,011, 520). Regarding claims 20-21 and 39, Barton discloses a waste gas cleaning system for removing harmful and/or toxic gases from a gas stream (Fig. 1), comprising: a reaction chamber (14) for treating and converting harmful and/or toxic gases (Col. 3, lines 1-10), said reaction chamber (14) having an inlet (60) for receiving a gas stream to be treated and an outlet (90); a plasma source (12) coupled to said reaction chamber (14) for providing excitation energy (Col. 3 lines 20-26) to said reaction chamber (14) for treating harmful and/or toxic gases for their removal and/or disposal and form a plasma therein; and a liquid jet pump (94) having a suction tube or port (90) arranged at said reaction chamber outlet (90) and generating sufficient negative pressure (Col. 6, lines 31-37) in

said reaction chamber (14) for generating a plasma therein. With respect to the liquid jet pump, Barton discloses the spray nozzles (94), which contains spray ring 16, which is connected to the reaction vessel outlet port 90, and connected to reservoir 98 of high pressure quench water (Col. 5, lines 15-45). The spray nozzles (94) appear to constitute a liquid jet pump of the claimed invention being the fact that the spray nozzles (94) spray the scrubbing liquid at a high pressure which draws and mixes the gas and scrubbing liquid and thereby, creates a negative pressure in the reaction chamber (Col. 5, lines 15-60). Barton discloses a liquid jet pump but is silent with respect to a liquid jet pump has a "constricted region" having a lower pressure that is connected via said suction tube or port to said reaction chamber to provide a vacuum drawing power or suction on said reaction chamber. Carr teaches that the spray nozzles 86, together with the flow constriction 90 (constricted region), is adjusted to create suction sufficient to draw the gaseous effluent into the main scrubbing chamber 22 and simultaneously intimately to mix the effluent with the scrubbing liquid (Col. 8, lines 28-43 and Figure 5). The inside surface 90 of the structure 84 converges to form a venturi or "constricted" region" of the claimed invention. Likewise, Carr also shows another embodiment on Figure 6 where nozzle (91) constitutes a liquid jet pump, has a constricted region (87) to increase the velocity of the scrubbing liquid (Col. 9, lines 1-30). Thus, it would have been obvious in view of Carr to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus of Barton with a liquid jet pump with a constricted region as taught by Carr in order to promote intermixing between the gas and scrubbing liquid and maintain a negative pressure in the scrubber system. Note, Applicant's original drawing (Figure 1

and Section 0036) shows a liquid jet pump (3), which is a "constricted" nozzle. There is no clear written description or illustration of the claimed "liquid jet pump" other than Figure 1 shows a liquid jet pump (3) which is a constricted nozzle (best understood by Examiner). Regarding claim 22, the above references fail to disclose the specific negative pressure range of the claimed invention, however, the applied references disclose the features of the claimed invention and it would have been prima facie obviousness to optimize the scrubbing system to obtain such negative pressure at most thru routine experimentation. See In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). Regarding claim 23, Barton discloses the liquid jet pump is provided with a sorption medium (110). Regarding claims 24-26 and 37, Barton fails to disclose a recirculation system including said liquid jet for said sorption medium. Carr teaches a recirculation system consisting of a circulation pump 100 and recirculation tank 218 with coolant coils (Col. 13, lines 35-38) and control panel 224 to control the recirculation flow rate (Col. 13, lines 45-52) and a reservoir having neutralized agent (Col. 13, lines 52-54) to prevent build up in the system and further facilitating self-cleaning of the gas in the scrubber (Col. 4, lines 34-41). Thus, it would have been obvious in view of Carr to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the scrubbing system of Barton with a recirculation system as taught by Carr in order to control the build up in the system and facilitating self-cleaning of the gas scrubber. Regarding claim 27, it is conventional to provide a circulation pump with a compressed air-driven diaphragm pump in the scrubbing system and it would have been obvious to do so here due to its low maintenance and reliability. Regarding claim 28, Barton discloses a secondary air inlet

(via line 44), which appears to contribute to the negative pressure in the reaction chamber. Regarding claim 29, Barton discloses an additional gas (via line 70) to the reaction burner 12 to facilitate the combustion process. Regarding claims 30-31, it is conventional to provide additional gas such as hydrogen, oxygen, and water vapor the reaction chamber and it would have been obvious to do so here to facilitate the oxidation and/or decomposition process. Regarding claim 36, Barton discloses the output of the pump 112 is control by a pH sensor and control is connected to the metering pump to provide alkaline material to the quench water (Col. 5, lines 46-63). Regarding claim 38, Barton discloses the suction line includes at least one aerosol filter (24).

2. Claims 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applied references (Barton '877 in view of Carr et al. '520) and further in view of Wofford et al. (5,750,823). The applied references disclose the plasma source but is silent with respect to a non-thermal plasma source with excitation energy in the microwave range of the claimed invention. Wofford teaches the waste gas is exposed in a non-thermal plasma (Abstract) with microwave energy (Col. 3, lines 5-10) having the microwave range (Col. 5, lines 1-10) of the claimed invention and the use of a non-thermal plasma provide the advantages of reduced energy consumption and more easily removed by-products (Col. 1, lines 4-67 and Col. 2 lines 1-15). Thus, it would have been obvious in view of Wofford to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the

apparatus of the applied references with a non-thermal plasma source as taught by Wofford in order to gain the above advantages.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed December 18, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue the applied references above fail to disclose or suggest a liquid jet pump of the instant claim. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The above combination of Barton and Carr discloses the features of the claimed invention. Examiner's comment with respect to the "liquid jet pump" in the previous office action dated on 2/7/07 continues to apply here.

Note, Applicants' original drawing (Figure 1 and Section 0036) shows a liquid jet pump (3), which is a "constricted" nozzle. There is no clear written description or illustration of the claimed "liquid jet pump" other than Figure 1 shows a liquid jet pump (3) which is a constricted nozzle (best understood by Examiner). Examiner agrees the liquid jet pump (3) or constricted nozzle (3) creates a "Venturi Effect" for liquid jet as urged by Applicants and the applied references above describe the claimed liquid jet pump or constricted nozzle as claimed.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/018,116

Art Unit: 1764

Page 7

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Tom P. Duong whose telephone number is (571) 272-

2794. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM - 4:30PM (IFP).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Gienn Caldarola

Supervisory Patent Examiner

Technology Center 1700

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tom Duong June 11, 2007

T.D